



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/092,463	03/08/2002	Noriko Soma	1076.1074	1195

21171 7590 11/17/2006

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

BADII, BEHRANG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3694

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/092,463	Applicant(s) SOMA, NORIKO	
	Examiner Behrang Badii	Art Unit 3694	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 August 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3, 5-10 and 12-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3, 5-10 and 12-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 8/21/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Ninokata discloses a session database being generated and terminated, storing information in the session database and accessing of the session databases upon a user's search (abstract, p158, 203, 228 and 352; fig's 13, 15-16).

As per the applicant's modification of information to design asset information (information/data), this is still considered information or data and is further considered functional.

A session database is well known in the art and obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to be created and deleted or terminated when the session ends. Further, Sampson et al. discloses the creation and deletion of a session database (col.13) as discussed below.

Ninokata et al. discloses a user having privilege (user authorization or authentication) to access information (p221, 263, 283, 299, 315 and 328)

2112 [R-3] Requirements of Rejection Based on Inherency; Burden of Proof

The express, implicit, and inherent disclosures of a prior art reference may be relied upon in the rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. 102 or 103. "The inherent teaching of a prior art reference, a question of fact, arises both in the context of anticipation and obviousness." In re Napier, 55 F.3d 610, 613, 34 USPQ2d 1782, 1784 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (affirmed a 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection based in part on inherent disclosure

Art Unit: 3694

in one of the references). See also *In re Grasselli*, 713 F.2d 731, 739, 218 USPQ 769, 775 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

Claims 1, 3, 5-10 and 12-17 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, and 15-17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DiDomizio et al., U.S. patent 6,523,028, and further in view of Sampson et al., U.S. patent 6,490,624 or Goode et al., U.S. patent 6,166,730, or Guedalia et al. U.S. patent application publication 2002/0062345 or Ninokata et al., U.S. patent application publication 2001/0025306.

As per claim 1, 10 and 15-17, DiDomizio et al. discloses a search system for searching design asset information to find information, which a user has privilege to access and which is requested by the user, (abstract, Fig. 1), the search system comprising:

a first memory (storage, database) that stores the design asset information (information) (col.1, 50-67; Fig. 8);

a processor that accesses the first memory to retrieve design asset information (information/data), that the user accesses from the design asset information (information/data) stored in the first memory (col.1, 50-67; fig. 8), a database for

collecting the design asset information (information) and a second database for collecting access control information (information) used to set access privileges (clearance level) to the design asset information (information), and the processor refers to the access control information (information) to retrieve the privileged information from the first database, and generate the session database by collecting the privileged information (col.2, 41-61; fig's. 1-2, 8-9). DiDomizio et al. does not disclose the user having privilege to access information or a memory that stores a session database in which the retrieved design asset information (information/data) is collected, wherein the session database is generated when the user starts a session and is deleted when the session is terminated, and wherein the search system searches information requested by the user from the session database or a session database being generated and terminated, storing information in the session database and accessing of the session databases upon a user's search.

Ninokata et al. discloses that the user has privilege to access the information (user authentication, checking for user authentication) (p221, 263, 283, 299, 315 and 328). Sampson et al. (col.13, 55-60) or Goode et al. (col.10, 34-54; col.16, 47-59) or Guedalia et al. (p46-48) or Ninokata et al. (p249) disclose a memory that stores a session database in which information, which the user has privilege to access, is collected, wherein the session database is generated when the user starts a session and is deleted when the session is terminated, and wherein the search system searches information requested by the user from the session database and a session database being generated and terminated, storing information in the session database and

Art Unit: 3694

accessing of the session databases upon a user's search (abstract, p158, 203, 228 and 352; fig's 13, 15-16).

It would have been obvious to modify DiDomizio et al to include that the user has privilege to access the information (user authentication, checking for user authentication) and a session database being generated and terminated, storing information in the session database and accessing of the session databases upon a user's search such as that taught by Ninokata et al. and a memory that stores a session database in which information, which the user has privilege to access, is collected, wherein the session database is generated when the user starts a session and is deleted when the session is terminated, and wherein the search system searches information requested by the user from the session database such as that taught by Sampson et al. (col.13, 55-60) or Goode et al. (col.10, 34-54; col.16, 47-59) or Guedalia et al. (p46-48) or Ninokata et al. (p249) in order to secure that the information after the session is not present to unauthorized parties and to free up space by removing the session data.

As per claim 3, DiDomizio et al. further discloses access control information (information), including information of access privilege groups (clearance) for setting the access privileges to the design asset information (information/data) and information for defining at least one of the access privilege groups to which the user belongs, and wherein the session database is generated for each of the access privilege groups (col.3, 39-54; fig's. 1-2,4,8-9).

Claims 5-10; 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DiDomizio et al., U.S. patent 6,523,028 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Erb et al., U.S. patent 6,246,678.

As per claim 4, DiDomizio et al. discloses a search system for searching design asset information to find information, which a user has privilege to access and which is requested by the user, and for providing the user with the privileged and requested information as described above. DiDomizio et al. does not disclose a database, which is generated when the user starts a session and is held until the session is terminated (sessions started and terminated by a user). Erb et al. discloses a database, which is generated when the user starts a session and is held until the session is terminated (sessions started and terminated by a user) (col.34, 1-4). It would have been obvious to modify DiDomizio to include a database which is generated when the user starts a session and is held until the session is terminated (sessions started and terminated by a user) such as that taught by Erb et al. in order to manage the employment of the search system by users via recording how much each user has used the search system.

As per claim 5, DiDomizio et al. further disclose including the first database, the second database, and the session database (DiDomizio: fig's.1-2); and

at least one client computer connected to the server through a network (DiDomizio: fig's.1-2);

wherein the user inputs a search query in the client computer, the client computer sends the search query to the server, the server acquires design asset information (information/data) that matches the search query from the session

Art Unit: 3694

database, and the server provides the acquired design asset information (information/data) to the client computer (DiDomizio: abstract; fig's.1-2). DiDomizio et al. does not disclose a server. Erb et al. discloses at least one server (database server) (Erb et al.: col.8 1-67; fig's 3-4). It would have been obvious to modify DiDomizio et al. to include a database server such as that taught by Erb et al. in order to manage the employment of the search system by users via recording how much each user has used the search system.

As per claim 6, DiDomizio et al. further discloses wherein the design asset information (information/data) is IP catalogue information (information)that includes management information, substantial data, and category classification information of IP catalogues, wherein the processor refers to the access control information to retrieve the management information, the substantial data, and the category classification information of IP catalogues, which the user has privilege to access, and wherein the third database includes a first retrieved information database for collecting the retrieved management information, a second retrieved information database for collecting the retrieved substantial data, and a third retrieved information database for collecting the retrieved category classification information (databases that are connected and composed of different parts) (abstract; fig's. 1-2).

As per claim 7, DiDomizio et al. further discloses searching the first retrieved information database (searching a database) for the management information of IP catalogues that match the search query of the user and provides the management information of the matched IP catalogues to the client computer (abstract; fig's. 1-2,8-9).

As per claim 8, DiDomizio et al. further discloses searching the second retrieved information database (searching a database) for the substantial data of IP catalogues that match the search query of the user and provides the substantial data of the matched IP catalogues to the client computer (abstract; fig's. 1-2,8-9).

As per claim 9, DiDomizio et al. further discloses searching the third retrieved information database (searching a database) for the category classification information of IP catalogues that match the search query of the user and provides the category classification information of the matched IP catalogues to the client computer (abstract; fig's. 1-2,8-9).

As per claim 10, DiDomizio et al. and Erb et al. further disclose a system for searching design asset information (information/data) comprising:

at least one server computer (database server) (Erb et al.: col. 8,1-67; fig's. 3-4);
and

at least one client computer connected to the at least one server computer
(DiDomizio et al.: fig's. 1-2), wherein the server computer includes:

a first memory that stores the design asset information (information/data)
(col.1, 50-67; fig's. 8-9); and

a processor that accesses the first memory to retrieve design asset information, that a user has privilege to access from the design asset information (information/data) stored in memory and generates a database of the retrieved privileged design asset information (information/data) when the user logs in to the server computer from the client computer, wherein, when the user inputs a

Art Unit: 3694

search query in the client computer and sends the search query to the server computer, the server computer searches the retrieved information database for privileged information that matches the users query and provides the matched privileged design asset information (information/data) to the client computer (storing information into a database and retrieving information from a database) (col.1, 50-67; col.3, 39-54; fig's. 1-2,8-9).

DiDomizio et al. does not disclose generating a session database and deleting (destroying) the session database. Sampson et al. (col.13, 55-60) or Goode et al. (col.10, 34-54; col.16, 47-59) or Guedalia et al. (p46-48) or Ninokata et al. (p249) discloses generating a session database and deleting (destroying) the session database. It would have been obvious to modify DiDomizio et al to include generating a session database and deleting (destroying) the session database in order to secure that the information after the session is not present to unauthorized parties and to free up space by removing the session data.

As per claim 12, DiDomizio et al. further discloses wherein the user belongs to at least one group, and wherein the privileged information is information, which the group the user belongs to has privilege to access (user has privilege/clearance to acquire information) (col.3,39-54; fig's.1-2,4,8-9).

As per claim 13, DiDomizio et al. further discloses a memory including an original database for collecting the design asset information (information/data) and a control database for collecting access control information of the design asset information (information/data) (memory/storage which includes databases), and wherein the

processor refers to the access control information to retrieve the privileged information from the original database (processor retrieving information from the database) (abstract; col.1, 50-67; fig's. 1-2,8-9).

As per claim 14, DiDomizio et al. further discloses each piece of the design asset information (information/data) includes an index and substantial data (information categorized into groups), and wherein the control database includes a definition database defining a group to which the user belongs, a catalogue access privilege database defining groups having privilege to access the index, and a substantial data access privilege database defining groups having privilege to access the substantial data (databases including two or more groups) (abstract; col.3, 39-54; fig's. 1-2,4,8-9).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Behrang Badii whose telephone number is 571-272-6879. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on 571-272-6712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to (571)273-8300

Hand delivered responses should be brought to


United States Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 3600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is **(571) 272-3600**.

Behrang Badii
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3694

Art Unit: 3694

BB


ELLA COLBERT
PRIMARY EXAMINER